POOR **QUALITY** THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT (S) ARE FADED &BLURRED

PHOTO MICROGRAPHICS INC.

L 9 (12-67)

PREAU OF LAW A-Z
MEMORANDUM Leon, Morris

BUREAU OF LAW

TO:

The State Tax Commission

FROM:

Solomon Sies, Nearing Officer

SUBJECT:

MALL LINE

Assessment #3-944104 - 1956

The issues involved herein are (a) whether or not empenses in connection with the sale of real property which were fucted from normal income by the temperar were properly credited as expenses of sale for capital gain tax purposes and disallowed as deductions from normal income by the State Sax Semmission, and (b) whether an amount of \$750, alleged by the taxpayer to be an "expense in connection with termination of contrast" and deducted by the taxpayer from normal income, was properly disallowed in its entirety by the State Tax Com

The taxpayor was the owner in fee of real property located at 9th Street near 37th Avenue, Long Emland City, Queens, N. T. He was also an officer and owner of 505 of the shares of capital stock of Ansie Motor Lines, Inc., a demostic corporation organized under the laws of the State of Her Tork, engaged in the trucking business. On May 1, 1953, the taxpayor entered into an agreement of loose of the long Emland City property with Anxie Motor Lines, Inc. for a term of El years. In October 1956, the taxpayor (the losses) entered into an agreement with Anxie Motor Lines, Inc. (the losses) for the concellation of the losses and surrender of the premises and pursuant thereto paid the losses \$4,000. The taxpayor further paid the amount of \$750 to the remaining stockholders of the corporation in connection with the purchase by him of the balance of capital stock from such stockholders. On Hovember 15, 1956 he sold the property, reporting the sale as a capital transaction. the sale as a capital transaction.

On his return for 1956, the tampayer reported salary income, interest income, restal income and expital gain on installment sale of real property. He deducted from nermal income \$1,650 for legal expense and \$4,000 for comecilation of income \$1,550 for legal expense and \$5,000 for camecilensen or lease mentioned above. In addition, he also deducted \$750 for "expense incurred in connection with income not reimbursed" and \$750 "expense in connection with termination of contract." On February 5, 1959, the Income Tax Bureau made an additional assemble disallowing the above-mentioned deductions but credited and allowed the aforesaid amounts of \$1,650 and \$4,000 as additional expenses of sale in recomputing the capital gain tax and imposed additional tax in the amount of \$360.68. On January 29, 1960 a cancellation was issued to the extent of \$25.25 based on an allowance of \$750 alleged by the taxpayer to be an "expense incurred in connection with income not reimbursed." This amount was allowed as a deduction from normal income as an expense of seeking new investments in connection with the taxpayer's rental and interest income.

The deduction of the other \$750 alleged by the tempayer to be an expense in connection with termination of contract was disallowed in its entirety since it represented purchases of additional capital stock.

The Board of Tax Appeals has consistently held that a lease is property and that therefore an amount paid by a leaser to a lease for surrender of the leasehold is not deductible as an ordinary business expense, but only as a capital expenditure recoverable over the life of the lease acquired. Borland v. Commissioner, 27 B.T.A. 538; Business Real Retate Trust of Region v. Commissioner, 25 B.T.A. 191; Bretzfelder v. Commissioner, 21 B.T.A. 789; Ellier v. Commissioner, 10 B.T.A. 383.

I am of the opinion that the deduction of legal expense involved the negotiation of the sale of the Long Island City property and that the amount claimed plus the amount paid for surrender of the leasehold were properly credited as additional expense of sale in the recomputation of capital gain tax; that the assessment, as partially cancelled, should be sustained.

For the resease stated above, I recommend that the determination of the Tax Commission in this matter be substantially in the form submitted herewith:

Carina Officer

May 16, 1968

6-19-68

STATE OF HEN TORK

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPRICADION

MORNIA LINE

THE SAX LAW FOR THE YEAR 14 OF THE SAX LAW FOR THE YEAR 14 OF

Horris Loom, having filed an application for revision or refund of personal income tames under Article 16 of the Sun Law for the year 1996 and a hearing having been held in connection therewith at the office of the State Sax Samisaian, 80 Santro Street, New York, New York on the 9th day of Huranber 1964 before Solomon Sice, Hearing Officer of the Department of Taxation and Pinance, at which hearing the temperar appeared personally and use represented by Leon Schnwirth, CPA, testinosy having been taken and the matter having been duly examined and considered,

The State Sax Commission hereby finds:

(1) That during the year involved and prior thereto, the temperer was the owner in fee of various parents of real property located in New York State at Jamaien, Passingdale, Michardle and Long Island City; that the temperer filed a New York State income tem return for the year 1996 in which he reported calary income and interest income; he further reported restal income from the last two parcels located at Michardle and Long Island City and capital gains on installment cale of the parcels of real property located at Sumice, Passingdale and Long Island City.

- (2) That the temperor sequired the Long Inland City property (located at 9th Street near 37th Areans) in 1953; that the temperor prior to and during the year 1956 was the precident and owner of 50% of the shares of stock of Annie Noter Lines, Inc., a demostic corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York engaged in the trucking business at both Rickeville and Long Island City; that on May 1, 1953, the temperor entered into an agreement of lonce with Annie Noter Lines, Inc. on a tempe of the aforesaid premises located at Long Island City for a term of 21 years at a rental of \$9,000 per entere.
- (3) That in detator 1996 the tempeyer paid to the aforestic corporation the anomal of \$4,000 in consideration for the consulation of the loans and surrender of the premises; that in November 1966 the tempeyer sold the real property on an installment basis and reported the profit realised therefrom as a capital gain; that on his return for the year 1996 the tempeyer defined the \$4,000 from the rental income reported by him from the aforestic property.
- (4) That the tempoyer further deducted from reatel income the encount of \$1,650 which was paid by him in connection with the sale of the parents including the aforesaid Long Island City property.
- (5) That in October 1996 the temporer paid the amount of \$790 to the remaining stockholders of the aforesaid corporation in senacetion with the purchase by him of the balance of the capital stock from such stockholders; that the temporer reported this amount on his return as an additional deduction from his normal income, alleging such amount to be an "emponee in connection with termination of contract".

- (6) That, in addition, the tempeyor also reported on his return an additional amount of \$750 which he dedected from his normal income on the ground that this amount was "an expense incorred in connection with income not reinbursed."
- (7) That an Pahrany 5, 1969 the Department of Tamation and Finance under an additional accomment equinot the tempeyor for the year 1986 (Accomment 62-544104) disablewing all of the above deductions from normal income but allowing the amount of \$1,450 legal force and the amount of \$4,000 paid for cancellation of the lease as additional expenses incurred in the cale of the real property for capital gains purposes; that, accordingly, the expital gain tax was recomputed and set additional taxos in the amount of \$360,60 was imposed.
- (8) That an Jamesry 29, 1966 a partial concellation in the amount of \$26.25 was issued based upon an allowance in the amount of \$750 deducted from normal income by the tempeyor as "expenses incurred in connection with income not reinbursed" on the ground that this amount reported expenses of seeking now investments in connection with the tempeyor's rental and interest income.

Based upon the foregoing findings and all of the evidence presented herein,

The State Tex Commission hereby

(A) That the amount of \$4,000 paid by the temporer for the cancellation of the lance was not deductible as an ordinary expanse but only as a capital expanditure and properly credited and allowed in connection with the gain on the sale of said property.

- (3) That the deduction of \$2,690 for legal empenses in connection with the sale of the property of the tempeyor was not deductable from normal income but use property credited and deductable as an additional empense of the sale of said preparty.
- (6) That the deduction of \$750 representing payments made to the remaining stockholders for surrender of their charge of stock in Ameio Notor Lines, Inc., was not deductible as an evidency business expense and was properly disallowed since it constituted the cost of payeboxing additional stock.
- (D) That, accordingly, the additional accordance and against the temperar for the year 1956 (Accordance ##5-544264) partially consolid to the entent of \$5.55, is correct; that the case does not include any tax or other charge which could not have been landally demanded and that the temperar's applicables for revision or refund filed with respect thereto be and the case is hereby demied.

DATED: Albany, New York on the 19thday of

July

. 1058.

/s/ JOSEPH H. MURPHY

/s/ A.BRUCE MANLEY

/s/ SAMUEL E. LEPLER